

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, the Examiner said he did not consider the reference listed in the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) dated December 9, 2003 (“Dec. 2003 IDS”) on the grounds a copy of the document named in the IDS was not provided. (Final Office Action, pgs. 2-3). Applicants submit that the Dec. 2003 IDS listed an incorrect name for the reference actually provided. Applicants resubmitted the same reference in the January 7, 2007 IDS with the correct name, which the Examiner reviewed and initialed. Thus, the Examiner reviewed the reference Applicants intended to submit in the Dec. 2003 IDS, but incorrectly named.

Applicants amended claims 2, 3, 4, and 5 to remove the “method” language and replace with “operations”.

1. Claims 1-12 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12 as anticipated (35 U.S.C. §102) by Shulman (U.S. Patent No. 6,026,233). Applicants traverse for the following reasons.

Claims 1 and 7 concern providing a code assist function to suggest candidates and require: parsing a partial program instruction statement into tokens; determining whether the tokens match one of a plurality of syntax statements; moving a cursor positioned on one of the tokens for which the match is determined to a following token in response to determining that the token matches one of the syntax statements; in response to determining that the token on which the cursor is positioned does not match one of the syntax statements generating proposals from the cursor position; and providing proposals to append to the partial program instruction statement to a user responsive to both the parsing of the program and the parsing of the partial program instruction statement.

Applicants submit that the cited Shulman does not disclose the claim requirement of in response to determining that the token on which the cursor is positioned does not match one of the syntax statements generating proposals from the cursor position.

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner cited col. 8, lines 28-31, FIGs. 3 and 4, and element 211 of Shulman as disclosing these requirements. (Final Office Action, pg. 3) The cited Shulman mentions that after the user types the characters mytext 211, the character position follows the last character. In response to typing the separator character 212, the statement building tool determines the set of menu items that correspond to the object type mytext and a

selection menu assist window 220 is displayed. Nowhere does this cited portion of Shulman disclose generating proposals at the cursor position if the token on which the cursor positioned does not match a syntax statement. Instead, the cited Shulman determines a set of menu items to display that “correspond” to the displayed object type mytext. There is no mention of the claim requirement of determining whether mytext does not match syntax statements and then displaying the menu items in response to determining that mytext does not match the syntax statement. Instead, in Shulman, mytext must match something because the cited building tool of Shulman determines menu items that correspond to mytext.

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner further cited FIGs. 5 and 6 and cursor 212 that moves to mytext and mytext.font. (Final Office Action, pg. 4) Applicants traverse. Shulman mentions that the building tool determines that the incomplete programming language statement mytext.font is an object of the font type and that a second selection menu assist window 530 displays a new set of menu items that correspond to the previously defined font object type for the user to select. (Shulman, col. 10, lines 26-37) Again there is no disclosure in the cited Shulman of generating proposed statements in response to determining that the statement mytext.font or some variation of it does not match syntax. Instead, the cited Shulman mentions that menu items that “correspond” to the defined object type are displayed. Thus, Shulman is implying that there is some match that triggers the corresponding menu items to be displayed.

The Examiner further cited steps 1337 and 1370 in FIG. 13B and col. 17, lines 40-45 as teaching the claim requirement of in response to determining that the token on which the cursor is positioned does not match one of the syntax statements generating proposals from the cursor position. (Final Office Action, pg. 6) Applicants traverse.

The cited steps 1337 and 1370 mention that if the token can be resolved, the processing continues. For instance, step 1337 states that if the present argument is a symbol, the assist window is generated. If it is not, control proceeds to step 1370 where control returns to step FIG. 10 or 11 where the statement building tool initializes an editing tool for use by the programmer. Nowhere is there any disclosure that if there is no match, proposals are generated from the cursor position. Instead, in the cited step 1337 if there is a match with a symbol, the code assist window is generated.

The cited col. 17 mentions if the symbol cannot be resolved, processing continues at step 1338. At step 1338, the context of the present argument token is determined by invoking the compiler to bind against the set of known symbols, and assist window is generated to display the information relevant to the present argument token. Nowhere does this cited col. 17 disclose or mention that if there is no match, proposals are generated from the cursor position. Instead, the cited col. 17 mentions that if the symbol cannot be resolved, an assist window is generated to display the information relevant to the present argument token. This does not disclose generating proposals from the cursor position as claimed.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 7 are patentable over the cited art because requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited Shulman.

Claims 2-6 and 8-12 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1 and 7, which are patentable over the cited art for the reason discussed above.

2. Claims 13-18 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 13-18 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Shulman. The Examiner found that claims 13-18 are computer format claims of the article of manufacture claims. (Final Office Action, pg. 9)

Applicants submit that claims 13-18 are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed with respect to claims 1-12.

3. New Claims 19, 20, and 21 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

New claims 19, 20, and 21 depend from claims 1, 7, and 13, respectively, and further require determining whether an end of the program instruction statement is reached and in response to determining that the end of the program instruction statement is reached, generating proposals.

These added requirements are disclosed on at least paras. 60 and 61 of Shulman.

Applicants submit that these added claims are patentable over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-21 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: November 13, 2007

By: /David Victor/

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David W. Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: (310) 553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984